

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Status of the Claims

Prior to entry of this amendment, claims 38-49 were pending in the application. An Office Action mailed June 8, 2007 (hereafter "Office Action") rejected claims 38, 39, 41, 43 and 47-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,311,151 to Yamamoto et al., (hereafter "Yamamoto"). The Office Action further rejected claim 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto in view of Peterson et al., (hereafter "Peterson"), rejected claims 42 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,416,903 to Malcom, (hereafter "Malcom"), and rejected claims 45 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,541,837 to Fushimoto, (hereafter "Fushimoto").

Claims 38 and 47-49 have been amended, claims 39, 43, 45, and 46 have been canceled, and no claims have been added. Therefore, after entry of this amendment, claims 38, 40-42, 44, and 47-49 remain pending for examination.

Amendments to the claims

Claims 38 and 47-49 have been amended to recite "wherein the providing of the interface for the translator is performed concurrently with development the source text of the computer program." Support for this amendment can be found throughout the application, including specifically, on page 18, lines 16-20 of the application and in canceled claim 43.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection, Written description

Claims 39 and 45 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection, but in the interest of furthering prosecution, have canceled these claims without prejudice or disclaimer.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection, Indefiniteness

Claims 45 and 46 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. However, in order to expedite allowance of in this case, applicants have canceled claim 46 thus obviating this rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection, Yamamoto

As noted above, claims 38, 39, 41, 43 and 47-49 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Yamamoto. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and it is submitted that the claims, at least as amended, are allowable over Yamamoto.

Yamamoto generally discloses a system for providing language translators with contextual information for text to be translated. Yamamoto, Abs. Yamamoto's Fig. 4 describes the translation process. Particularly, company A, located in country A, builds and packages localization files that are to be translated and ships them the company B, located in country B. Company B then performs testing and translation on the packaged files. *Id.*, col. 4, ll. 51-67, *see also Id.*, at Fig. 4. Yamamoto further discloses that during the translation process a "pop-up" editor window accompanies the text to be translated. The "pop-up" editor will appear when, for example, a "button" with the text "CANCEL" displayed on it is selected. The translator then enters the translation of the text in the editor window. *Id.*, col. 5, ll. 14-29, *see also Id.*, col. 6, ll. 53-59.

1. Yamamoto does not teach that the providing of the interface for the translator is performed concurrently with development the source text of the computer program.

In contrast, amended independent claim 38 is directed to a method of translating software source code concurrently with development of the code. As such, claim 38 provides a more dynamic and integrated translation method than that contemplated by Yamamoto.

Merely by way of example, claim 38 recites, inter alia, that "the providing of the interface for the translator is performed concurrently with development the source text of the

computer program." The Office Action at pages 6 and 7, section 8 recite col. 3, ll. 12-23 and col. 5, ll. 14-26, respectively, of Yamamoto as teaching this element. The cited sections of Yamamoto teach a pop-up editor window that is used to translate the text of selected GUI components; however, the translation is not preformed concurrently with the development of the computer program, as in claim 38.

Instead, Yamamoto discloses that the files to be translated are first shipped from company A in country A to company B in country B. Where company B then performs the translation process. Consequently, because the computer program in Yamamoto is completed and then shipped, the translation is necessarily preformed after the development of the program, as opposed to concurrently with the development of the program, as in claim 38. For at least this reason, the Office Action has not established that Yamamoto anticipates claim 38.

2. Yamamoto does not teach a translator to provide a translation of at least some of the source text.

Furthermore, claim 38 recites, in pertinent part, "providing an interface for a translator to provide a translation of at least some of the source text into a second natural language" (emphasis added). The Office Action asserts that Yamamoto, at col. 3, ll. 13-15, discloses providing a translation of source text. Office Action, at page 5, section 8. A review of those passages (as well as the remainder of Yamamoto), however, fails to reveal any such disclosure. Instead, col. 3, ll. 13-15 discloses that "[t]he translator is present with a graphical user interface in the base language, and can then...translate each text label on the screen." In addition, col. 7, ll. 28-30 discloses that "the translator selects [a] button, an editor pop-up window is displayed, and the translator will enter the translated text for that button."

As such, instead of translating source text, as in claim 38, Yamamoto translates buttons and other GUI components in a completed program. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Yamamoto fails to teach translating source text, and instead teaches translating text included on components within a completed program GUI.

For at least these reasons, claim 38 is believed to be allowable over Yamamoto. Independent claims 47, 48 and 49 recite similar elements to some of those described above with respect to claim 38 and therefore are believed to be allowable for at least similar reasons.

Dependent claims 39-42, 44 and 45 ultimately each depend from independent claim 38, and therefore are believed to be allowable over Yamamoto at least by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections

As noted above, claim 40 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto in view of Peterson, claims 42 and 44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto in view of Malcom, and claims 45 and 46 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto in view of Fushimoto. These rejections are respectfully traversed as well. Claims 40, 42, 44 and 45 depend from claim 38 and are believed to be allowable over any combination of Yamamoto, Peterson, Malcom and Fushimoto, at least by virtue of that dependence.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Chad E. King/
Chad E. King
Reg. No. 44,187

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300

CEK/CWG:slb-jp
61081540 v1